

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0135268 ("Simon") in view of U.S. Patent 6,044,462 ("Zubeldia"). Simon is directed to a mesh wireless network having two or more mesh routers that communicate wirelessly to an end device(s), such as a mobile station(s). Par. [0022], FIG. 1. If one mesh router of the mesh network operates outside the bounds of prescribed network behavior, the mesh router may be considered delinquent in which case the certificate associated with the delinquent router may also be considered delinquent. Par. [0051]. A mesh router designated as a neighborhood administrator may then transmit exclusion notifications to other mesh routers in the neighborhood. Par. [0064]. Simon therefore discloses network infrastructure operations for a spontaneously formed network, namely a method and network routers for controlling, to some degree, spontaneously-formed wireless networks. Simon does not appear to describe mobile station operations as required by the claims. In addition Simon is directed to a different problem and describes a different mobile station from those claimed.

Also, as the Examiner stated, "Simon does not disclose expressly about the certificate revocation notification." It is alleged that Zubeldia discloses details of a certificate revocation notification. Applicants respectfully disagree and further submit that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Simon with the teachings of Zubeldia. It is suggested, for example, that Zubeldia FIG. 2; col. 4, lines 1-20; col. 3, lines 10-20, col. 1, lines 20-42, and col. 2, line 22 teach a certificate revocation notification including a certification authority identifier, revocation reason data, signed comparison data, and data representing a certificate of interest. As a preliminary note, Zubeldia, as best understood, does not disclose a certification identifier or signed comparison data.

More importantly, however, the Examiner referenced FIG. 2 as illustrating a certificate revocation notification, but in contrast, FIG. 2 (and the other cited portions) describe elements in a certificate revocation list ("CRL"). As disclosed in Applicants' Background of the Invention, the use of CRLs is one known method of certificate revocation. Par. [0005]. In a mobile device, however, using a CRL can be problematic due to bandwidth restrictions and processing requirements. Par. [0009]. Thus, not only does Zubeldia not disclose certificate revocation notifications that are transmitted over a broadcast channel, Zubeldia also teaches the use of CRLs, i.e., it teaches away from Applicants' claimed mobile devices and methods.

As to claim 1, for example, Simon in view of Zubeldia does not teach or suggest, among other things, a mobile device having an authenticator operative to receive the certificate revocation notification sent over a broadcast channel, the authenticator operative to authenticate signed comparison data included within the certificate revocation notification in a mobile device. Furthermore, as Applicants disclose in the Background to the Invention, data communication in mobile devices presents unique problems related to bandwidth limitations and available memory. The Examiner said, "Simon teaches providing control and accountability through the use of digital certificate and associated revocation list over a wireless network environment." (Emphasis added.) As discussed above, Zubeldia also includes the use of certificate revocation lists. Thus, several things are apparent: (1) Neither Simon nor Zubeldia, either alone or in view of each other, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter; and (2) Simon and Zubeldia actually teach away from the problems addressed in Applicants' disclosure, e.g., limited bandwidth and limited memory. Claim 1, therefore, is in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add new and nonobvious subject matter and are also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 10, 18, and 22, the Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks above. For example, Simon and Zubeldia, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, inter alia, a certificate revocation notification for use in a method in a mobile device(s) as used in Applicants' claims 10, 18, or 22. As to claim 22, for example, Simon in view of Zubeldia does not teach or suggest authenticating that includes "generating a first verification value from the signed comparison data and the data representing a certificate of interest; generating a second verification value based on the certification authority identifier and the revocation reason data; and comparing the first verification value with the second verification value." These claims, therefore, are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add new and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon in view of Zubeldia and in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110504 ("Kenagy"). Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above. For example, Simon in view of Zubeldia does not teach or suggest, as to claim 24, authentication that includes "generating a first verification value from the signed comparison data and the data representing a certificate of interest; generating a second verification value based on the certification authority identifier and the revocation reason data; and comparing the first verification value with the second verification value." Kenagy, as best understood, does not disclose anything that, when viewed in light of Simon and/or Zubeldia, would make the claimed subject matter, e.g., the authentication method, obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, these claims are in condition for allowance.


Claims 14 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon in view of Zubeldia and in view of U.S. Patent 6,775,771 ("Shrader"). Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above. Furthermore, since claims 14 and 23

contain all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend and since those claims are allowable, claims 14 and 23 are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/20/07

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
312/609-7599  
312/609-5005 Facsimile